

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 7 to 16 are pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of Claims 7 to 11 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 7 to 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Japanese Patent No. 2002-280237 (“Masahiro”) and U.S. Patent No. 5,703,462 (“Woody”). For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Masahiro and Woody does not render unpatentable claims 7 to 11.

Claim 7, as presented, relates to an ignition coil of an ignition system in an internal combustion engine, including, in relevant part, at least one electrically conductive component having, at least in some areas, an arrangement for an electrically effective evening out of its surface, the arrangement having at least one edge. Support for this amendment can be found, for example, at page 6, lines 14 to 17 of the specification, as well as Figure 3. The Office Action refers to Masahiro as disclosing all of the elements of claim 7. Specifically, the Office Action refers to the center core 110 and the wrap tube 111 as disclosing the electrically conductive component and the arrangement for an electrically effective evening out of its surface, respectively.

Center core 110 and wrap tube 111 of Masahiro do not disclose, or even suggest, the electrically conductive component having an arrangement for an electrically effective evening out of its surface, the arrangement having at least one edge. As repeatedly described in Masahiro, for example, at page 2, paragraph 7, and page 3, paragraph 14, center core 110 is formed in the shape of an approximate circle pillar. The wrap tube 111, which is formed around the approximate circle pillar center core 110, is tubular, as indicated in Figures 4 and 5b and throughout the specification. In the Response to Arguments section of the Final Office Action, the Examiner concluded that wrap tube 111 “around a circular pillar would have a straight side.” Although it may be arguable whether wrap tube 111 has a straight side, it is incontrovertible that it **does not** have any **edges**, since it is *tubular*. Further, since wrap tube 111 does not have any *faces*, it can not have any *flat surfaces*, and therefore **can not even out** any other surfaces.

As the geometry of the structure of the present application is a significant factor in the risk of electrical breakdown, as described on page 2, lines 20 to 28 of the specification, such structure is not obvious over the disclosure of Masahiro. As such, Masahiro does not disclose, or even suggest, the electrically conductive component having an arrangement for an electrically effective evening out of its surface, the arrangement having at least one edge. Woody does not cure the critical deficiencies of Masahiro. Therefore, the combination of Masahiro and Woody does not render unpatentable independent claim 7, as presented, or dependent claims 8 to 11.

Withdrawal of the present rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claim 12 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Masahiro, Woody and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0108931 (“Takeyama”). For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Masahiro, Woody and Takeyama does not render unpatentable claim 12.

Claim 12 depends from claim 7 and therefore includes all of the features of claim 7. As more fully set forth above with respect to claim 7, the combination of Masahiro and Woody does not disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 7. Takeyama does not cure the critical deficiencies of the Masahiro and Woody references. Therefore, the combination of Masahiro, Woody and Takeyama does not render unpatentable claim 12, which depends from claim 7.

Withdrawal of the present rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection of Claims 13 to 16 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 13 to 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Masahiro. For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Masahiro does not render unpatentable claims 13 to 16.

Claim 13, as presented, relates to an ignition coil of an ignition system in an internal combustion engine, including, in relevant part, a magnetically active inner core, which is surrounded by a primary winding and a secondary winding; and a magnetically active outer core; wherein at least the inner core, the primary winding and the secondary winding being surrounded by a cast resin for fixing in the housing, wherein the inner core is surrounded by a first electrically conductive plastic covering the inner core on a side facing the primary winding, and the outer core is surrounded by a second electrically conductive

plastic covering the outer core on a side facing the secondary winding; and wherein the plastic covering is sprayed onto the inner core and the outer core as a coating.

Masahiro describes the wrap tube 111 and the resin layer 154 as tubular, sleeve-like features. The Examiner refers to page 2, paragraphs 7 to 11, and 14, and Figs. 2, 4, and 5b of Masahiro as allegedly disclosing that the plastic covering is sprayed onto the inner core and the outer core as a coating. However, nowhere in the paragraphs and figures referred to by the Examiner, or anywhere else in Masahiro, is the plastic covering of the present claim - which is featured as a coating - disclosed. The coating of the present invention more completely conforms to the edges of the underlying inner and outer cores, and can provide protection against the same problems as Masahiro, but with smaller space and manufacturing requirements, and greater flexibility for use with various geometries. Further, the coating is better suited to prevent electrical breakdown, since the contact between the coating and the core is more intimate.

As such, Masahiro does not disclose, or even suggest, that the plastic covering is sprayed onto the inner core and the outer core as a coating. Therefore, Masahiro does not render unpatentable independent claim 13, as presented, or dependent claims 14 to 16.

Withdrawal of the present rejection is respectfully requested.

V. Conclusion

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 13, 2009

By: /Clifford A. Ulrich/
Clifford A. Ulrich, Reg. No. 42,194 for
Gerard A. Messina (Reg. No. 35,952)

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200
CUSTOMER NO. 26646